

**REMARKS**

As a matter of review, Claims 9 - 15, 27 - 41, and 43 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 21 - 22 stand cancelled without prejudice. Applicants have elected with traverse to prosecute the Claims of Group I (i.e., Claims 1 - 8, 16 - 26, and 42). Page 6 of the Office Action indicates that Claims 8 and 26 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

As suggested by the Examiner, Claims 8 and 26 have been rewritten in independent form. Claim 8 has been rewritten to include the limitations of Claim 1. The dependencies of Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 42 have been changed to depend from Claim 8. Claim 26 has been rewritten to include the limitations of Claim 24. The dependency of Claim 25 has been changed to depend from Claim 26. Claims 1, 16 - 20, and 23 are cancelled herewith without prejudice.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections and §103 Rejections**

Claims 1 - 4, 6, 24, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 3,029,852 issued to Taylor (hereinafter "Taylor") for the reasons of record stated on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

Claims 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 4,662,517 issued to Wirth (hereinafter "Wirth") for the reasons of record stated on page 3 of the Office Action.

Claims 1 - 5, 24, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,223,367 issued to French et al. (hereinafter "French") for the reasons of record stated on page 4 of the Office Action.

Claims 7 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor or French for the reasons of record stated on page 5 of the Office Action.

Claims 16 - 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 2,547,588 issued to Geysel (hereinafter "Geysel") for the reasons of record stated on page 5 of the Office Action.

Claims 16 - 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MacCormack et al. (hereinafter "MacCormack") for the reasons of record indicated on page 6 of the Office Action.

With regard to Claims 2 - 4 - 8, 25 - 26, and 42, it is believed that the amendments included herewith overcome all rejections and that these Claims are now in condition for allowance.

**SUMMARY**

This RCE is responsive to the final Office Action of September 7, 2004. All fees associated with this should be charged to Deposit Account No.: 16-2485. Claims 8 and 26 have been amended to include all limitations of their respective base claims. The dependencies of Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 42 have been changed to depend from Claim 8. The dependency of Claim 25 has been changed to depend from Claim 26. Claims 1, 16 - 20, and 23 are cancelled herewith without prejudice. It is believed that Claims 2 - 4 - 8, 25 - 26, and 42 are now in condition for allowance. New claim 44 has been added. Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 2, 4 - 8, 25 - 26, and 42 and new Claim 44.

Respectfully submitted,  
FOR: CURRY ET AL.;

BY: 

Julia A. Glazer  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 41,783  
(513) 627-4132

Dated: December 7, 2004  
Customer Number: 27752